

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed August 17, 2010. Claims 1-6 and 8-32 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 20, 25, 31, and 32 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter because support for the amendments may be found at least in paragraphs 91-99 and 101-115 and Figures 6, 7A, and 7B of the specification as originally filed. No claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 8-32 are presented for examination. Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Summary of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting an Examiner Interview on October 7, 2010. In the Examiner Interview, the claims were discussed in light of the §103 rejection with regard to reference U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722 to Bradshaw, U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618 to Shannon, and U.S. Patent No. 6,507,846 to Consens. In particular, possible clarifying amendments were discussed. The Examiner acknowledged that the clarifying amendments appear to overcome the cited references. No agreement on patentability was reached.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 20, 31, and 32

Claims 1, 20, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states that “the positional information in the abstract data structure being unrelated to the text searched” is not explicitly stated in the specification as originally filed. Applicants have removed this element of claims 1,

20, 31, and 32. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the removal of the rejection of claims 1, 20, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722, hereinafter “Bradshaw”), in view of Shannon (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618, hereinafter “Shannon”) and further in view of Consens (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,846, hereinafter Consens).

Bradshaw is directed to preventing future access to vulgar Internet sites and future creation of vulgar documents. Specifically, Bradshaw describes blocking attempts to access and transmit vulgar and pornographic material. Bradshaw monitors data being passed into and out of a topmost application and compares the data to data stored in libraries stored in volatile computer memory.

Shannon describes a client that sends a packet, carrying a request for a web page, to a server. A network device that acts as a gateway between the client and the server receives the packet from the client before it is delivered to the server. The network device determines whether the client is trying to access a restricted web page by comparing the destination URL and the destination IP address in the packet against a database within the network device containing a list of URLs and IP addresses for restricted web pages.

Consens discloses a method of indexing data sources to permit efficient relational queries on the data sources. An index is created from the data sources. The index is then used by an application program to efficiently perform a query (search) on the data sources. The index has

several data structures, including a data structure that relates to the position of the token data and a data structure that is based on a lexicographic ordering of tokens.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part searching text of each document in the plurality of documents for a sequence of fragments that resembles data elements from at least one random row in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element. Claim 1, as amended, further recites in part detecting locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device, the detection indicating that a user of the client device has caused the portion of the preselected data residing on the server to be stored on the client device, the detecting comprising determining that the sequence of data fragments matches data elements from one or more columns in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure.

Bradshaw does not teach or suggest the claimed searching. The Examiner acknowledges that Bradshaw does not teach or suggest an abstract data structure containing positional information identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element. Because Bradshaw does not teach or suggest positional information in the abstract data structure, Bradshaw cannot teach or suggest searching text of each document in the plurality of documents for a sequence of fragments that resembles data elements from at least one random row in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element as claimed. Furthermore, Bradshaw monitors data being passed into and out of an application and compares the data to libraries stored in memory. Therefore, Bradshaw discloses a data stream that is compared to a plurality of documents. In contrast, the present invention as claimed searches text of each document in the plurality of documents for a sequence of fragments that resembles data elements from at least

one random row in the pre-selected data. In addition, Bradshaw looks for an exact match between the data in the data stream and the libraries. In contrast, the present invention as claimed looks for a sequence of fragments that resembles data elements from the pre-selected data.

Moreover, Bradshaw does not teach or suggest the claimed detecting. Because Bradshaw does not teach or suggest positional information in the abstract data structure, Bradshaw cannot teach or suggest detecting locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device, the detection indicating that a user of the client device has caused the portion of the preselected data residing on the server to be stored on the client device, the detecting comprising determining that the sequence of data fragments matches data elements from one or more columns in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure as claimed. Furthermore, the Examiner appears to be equating Bradshaw's closing of a monitoring routine to the claimed detecting. Applicants respectfully submit that Bradshaw's closing of a monitoring routine cannot be properly interpreted as equivalent to the claimed detecting. Bradshaw's closing of a monitoring routine simply turns off the monitoring routine, thereby allowing a user to store pre-selected data onto the client device. Therefore, Bradshaw may simply store the pre-selected data, but does not actually detect the pre-selected data on the client device. In contrast, the present invention as claimed detects locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device, the detection indicating that a user of the client device has caused the portion of the preselected data residing on the server to be stored on the client device. Moreover, Bradshaw's closing of the monitoring routine only causes the monitoring routine to stop monitoring. Therefore, Bradshaw's closing of the monitoring routine does not

determine that the sequence of data fragments matches data elements from one or more columns in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure as claimed.

Shannon does not teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 that are missing from Bradshaw. The Examiner acknowledges that Shannon does not teach or suggest an abstract data structure containing positional information identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element. Because Shannon does not teach or suggest positional information in the abstract data structure, Shannon cannot teach or suggest searching, locally, text contained in a plurality of documents stored on a plurality of data storage media of the client device for an indication that at least a portion of the pre-selected data stored on the server is contained in the text of the plurality of documents, the searching comprising searching text of each document in the plurality of documents for a sequence of fragments that resembles data elements from at least one random row in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element as claimed.

Moreover, because Shannon does not teach or suggest positional information in the abstract data structure, Shannon cannot teach or suggest detecting locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device, the detection indicating that a user of the client device has caused the portion of the preselected data residing on the server to be stored on the client device, the detecting comprising determining that the sequence of data fragments matches data elements from one or more columns in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure as claimed.

Consens fails to teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 which are missing from each of Bradshaw and Shannon. Consens simply searches data sources in a database using an index including a positional data structure. Nowhere does Consens teach or suggest searching text of

each document in the plurality of documents for a sequence of fragments that resembles data elements from at least one random row in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure identifying the position in the pre-selected data for each data element as claimed. Furthermore, nowhere does Consens teach or suggest detecting locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data in the text of at least one of the plurality of documents stored on any of the plurality of data storage media of the client device, the detection indicating that a user of the client device has caused the portion of the preselected data residing on the server to be stored on the client device, the detecting comprising determining that the sequence of data fragments matches data elements from one or more columns in the pre-selected data using the positional information in the abstract data structure as claimed.

Hence, Consens is missing the same elements as Bradshaw and Shannon. Accordingly, Bradshaw, Shannon, and Consens, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the elements of the present invention that are included in the language of claim 1 as amended. Similar language is also included in independent claims 20, 31, and 32. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 20, 31, and 32 and their corresponding dependent claims is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30

Claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, further in view of Consens, and further in view of Brandt (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter “Brandt”) filed December 23, 1996. Claims 4 and 16-19 are dependent on claim 1. Therefore, claims 4 and 16-19 include the same elements as claims 1. Claims 22 and 27-30 are dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claims 22 and 27-30 include the same elements as claims 20. As noted above, the combination of Bradshaw,

Shannon, and Consens do not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20 as amended. These features are also missing from Brandt. Brandt provides a common user interface for a software application accessed via the Internet. A software application runs on a web server computer system. However, Brandt does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claim 1. Thus, claims 4, 16-19, 22 and 27-30 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Claims 5 and 23

Claims 5 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, in view of Shannon, further in view of Consens further in view of Brandt, and further in view of Dascalu (US Patent No. 5,958,015) filed October 29, 1996. Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 includes the same elements as claim 1. Claim 23 is dependent on claim 20. Therefore, claim 23 includes the same elements as claim 20. As noted above, the combination of Bradshaw, Shannon, Consens, and Brandt does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. These features are also missing from Dascalu. Dascalu teaches a session wall that listens to communications sent over the network. Dascalu listens to communication messages exchanged between a client and a server and determines whether the messages can be permitted based on stored access rules. However, Dascalu does not teach or suggest the elements recited in claims 1 and 20. Thus, claims 5 and 23 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 16, 2010



Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 45,750

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300